



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,108	06/22/2005	Kenji Hirao	212457.00013	1292
27160 7590 01/09/2007 PATENT ADMINISTRATOR KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP 1025 THOMAS JEFFERSON STREET, N.W. EAST LOBBY: SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20007-5201			EXAMINER BRIGGS, NATHANAEL R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/09/2007	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

2

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/509,108	HIRAO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Nathanael R. Briggs	2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 October 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/24/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant argues that *Morishita et al.* (US 6,992,734) fails to disclose reinforcing frames that are joined at corners to form a picture frame. This is not persuasive. Clearly, Morishita discloses frames (1) and (2) which are joined at corners by screw holes (23), as shown in Figure 1 and disclosed in the specification (column 4, lines 44-52). Applicant's arguments are therefore unpersuasive.
3. Furthermore, Applicant argues that Morishita fails to disclose wherein the said reinforcing frames are provided with light leakage preventive structures where the end portions of the reinforcing frames come into contact to each other. However, the combination of frames (1) and (2) constitute a light leakage preventative structure, since they are opaque materials, and therefore light from the backlight unit (61) will not be leaked through them. Furthermore, the two frames are joined at the corners at the screw hole (23), which are the "joints" of the reinforcing frames. Applicant arguments are not persuasive.
4. Therefore, rejections of claims 1 and 3 are maintained.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Morishita et al. (US 6,992,734).

3. Regarding claim 1, Morishita discloses an LCD (see figure 1, for instance), having: a U-shaped main body case (3) having opposing side walls and other open portions and a relatively wide bottom wall, a backlight unit (61) housed in the main body (3), and an optical member (5) placed on the surfaces of both side walls of the main body case (3) while covering the backlight unit (61), wherein the optical member (5) is placed on the surfaces of both side walls of the main body case (3) where the backlight unit (61) is housed, and the outer periphery of the optical member (5) is encased by reinforcing frames (2) that are joined at corners (23) to form a picture frame. Claim 1 is therefore unpatentable.

4. Regarding claim 2, Morishita discloses the LCD according to claim 1 (see figure 1, for instance), wherein said optical member (5) has a light leakage preventive structure (24) where the surface side edge of the outer periphery of the optical member (5) is covered by the said reinforcing frames (2, 25). Claim 2 is therefore unpatentable.

5. Regarding claim 3, Morishita discloses the LCD according to claim 2 (see figure 1, for instance), wherein the joints of said reinforcing frames (2) are provided with light leakage preventive structures (24) where the end portions of the reinforcing frames (3) come into contact to each other. Claim 3 is therefore unpatentable.

6. Regarding claim 4, Morishita discloses the LCD according to claims 1-3 (see figure 1, for instance), wherein a transparent thick reinforcing plate (column 10, lines 1-7) is disposed on the rear surface of the said optical member (5). Claim 4 is therefore unpatentable.

7. Regarding claim 5, Morishita discloses the LCD according to claims 1-3 (see figure 1, for instance), wherein an LCD panel (4) is placed on an assembly encased by said reinforcing frames (2) and the LCD panel (4) is affixed to the said main body case (3) by an outer frame divided into several parts (1, 2, 3). Claim 5 is therefore unpatentable.

8. Regarding claim 6, Morishita discloses the LCD device according to claim 1 (see figure 1, for instance), wherein a lamp-supporting stage (64) of the said backlight unit (61) is disposed at the open end of the said main body case (3), while a middle member (641) is disposed on the lamp-supporting stage (64), and the said optical member (5) is affixed to the main body case (3) by the said reinforcing frames (2). Claim 6 is therefore unpatentable.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2871

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathanael R. Briggs whose telephone number is (571) 272-8992. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 AM - 5:30 PM Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Nathanael Briggs

Application/Control Number: 10/509,108

Page 6

Art Unit: 2871

12/26/2006

  
ANDREW SCHECHTER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER